DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 751 EC 090 982

AUTHOR Polsgrove, Lewis; Mosley, William
TITLE Management Approaches for Inner City Classrooms.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children (54th, Chicago, Illinois, April 4-9, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Change; Behavior Problems; *Class Management; *Disadvantaged Youth; Exceptional Child Education; Inner City; Operant Conditioning; *Self Control; Self Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Discussed are general and direct strategies for developing behavioral and academic self control in children in inner city classrooms. Reviewed are traditional classroom management practices in terms of nonmanagement, overmanagement, and mismanagement. Effective general strategies recommended include modeling by the teacher and behavioral rehearsal. Described are the following direct strategies: self monitoring, goal setting and self evaluation, and self reinforcement. Suggested is a four phase program to gradually develop self control beginning with self monitoring and guided self evaluation and ending with the child specifying his own goals, recording, charting, and evaluating his progress, and administering reinforcing consequences. (DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED127751

MANAGEMENT APPROACHES FOR INNER CITY CLASSROOMS

by

Lewis Polsgrove and William Mosley

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Since the mid-1950's an enormous amount of research and writing on poor and/or non-white children has been done (Friedman, 1970). Black inner city school-aged children have been the subjects of the bulk of these activities (Johnson, 1969); and this group has been studied and written about at length in terms of (1) attitudinal concerns such as self-esteem or self-concept (Grambs, 1965; Grier & Cobbs, 1968; McDonald & Gynther, 1965; Wendland, 1967), (2) school performance (Coleman, 1966) and (3) linguistic style (Fasold & Wolfram, 1970; Labov, 1970). With respect to self- esteem or self-concept, results of research indicate that inner city black children tend to perceive themselves less positively than do white children (Bridgette, 1968), but that we may not be appropriately addressing the question of self-concept in blacks (Bauchman, 1971). Other research focusing on the school performance of these children tends to indicate a high degree of below grade level performance and school failure (Jencks, 1972; Jensen, 1969). Research on the language or linguistic style of inner city black children indicates that the variant of American English spoken by inner city black children varies systematically from standard American English, but that this variance constitutes a linguistic difference and not a linguistic deficit. Thus, while most of the research and writing for the last twenty

EC090282

or so years has focused on inner city black children in the areas of self-concept, school performance, and language style, the impact of all three areas of research in affecting general school policy appears negligible.

In terms of the educational welfare of black inner city children, however, another issue exists which has been less the concern of researchers and which may have far more relevance for the educational welfare of these children. This is the ability of many inner city black children to produce appropriate social behaviors in school settings.

The point has been made elsewhere (Mosley & Spicker, 1975) that one of the factors affecting the educational welfare of poor children is probably their inability to produce those social behaviors in the classroom setting that teachers perceive as being appropriate. For instance, it has been reported that while teachers in suburban schools tend to spend about 30% of their teaching time attending to behavior management problems in the classroom, some teachers in inner city schools spend up to 80% of their time attending to these problems (Roberts, 1967). Other reports indicate that many white teachers perceive black children as having strange peculiarities (Groff, 1963), that experienced teachers attempt to transfer out of inner city schools (Rivlin, 1962), and that many beginning teachers are reluctant to accept appointments to inner city schools (Miller, 1963).

It is possible that by comparing inner city classroom behavior from the perspective of suburban classroom behavior, we are looking at the social behaviors of black children in inner city schools from a false perceptual context. Teachers may be regarding inner city pupil behavior as strange or peculiar, not because it is strange or peculiar, per se, but because it is not emblematic of suburban pupil behavior. As teachers, we may label behaviors as deficient not because they are deficient, but because we lack a

cross-cultural perspective--we fail to perceive social behaviors as representing socialization modes specific to various culturally different groups.

As Williams (1970) has observed, the problem is not the inability of inner city children to learn appropriate social behaviors. The problem centers around the lack of congruence between the social behaviors they have learned and those deemed essential by the schools. Where lack of congruence exists between the behaviors of the child and the behavioral expectations schools hold for children, the consequences often are negative for the child. In one pervasive sense, self-contained special education classes exist as testimony to our approach to resolving the issue presented by many inner city children who do not meet the "good" student model postulated by the ethnocentric ideal of the public schools (Garrison & Hammill, 1971; Hall, 1970; Mercer, 1971; Mosley, 1973).

For most teachers, it appears that students who most closely fit the non-poor Euro-American ideal of the "good" student are regarded as being the most "educable" (Larsen, 1975; Rist, 1970). The educational welfare of inner city black children would probably be better assured if they produced school behaviors common to those found in suburban schools, which are viewed as desirable by the society at large. We think this problem and the development of means to resolve it may be far more significant to the educational welfare of inner city black children than concerns about the self concept, linguistic habits, or scholastic performance of these children. It is conceivable that possibly improvement in these three areas might occur once the child learns to produce appropriate social behaviors in school settings. However, in order to produce appropriate school behaviors, these behaviors must first be acquired. Teachers of these children need to assume

more responsibility for socializing these children than they do presently.

They should become familiar with methodological procedures and available strategies which will enable them to facilitate the social development of inner city children with respect to the acquisition and production of appropriate social behaviors in school settings.

But few teachers have been taught to deal adequately with childrens' behavioral, motivational, and affective problems. Many of those that we come in contact with adhere to hand-me-down strategies such as, "Step down on them (the children) hard at first--let them know who's boss--then you can ease up if you want." This, alas, may be the only training after graduation in classroom management that they receive, and this input is usually acquired during the first year or two of teaching. As a result of their impoverished equipment, many potentially promising teachers may resort to control tactics that make children docile and compliant, that foster their conformity, that make them doubt their abilities, and that, "turn them off" to school and learning. Schools characteristically fail to provide neces ary structure for directing children's behavior, they typically misuse or overuse management techniques that might be potentially liberating for the teacher as well as the student; indeed, the goal of many schools seems to be one of <u>control</u> of children's behavior rather than of teaching them to become self-directing individuals.

It is our belief that many inner city school environments, because of their emphasis on external methods of controlling children's behavior, fail to meet their needs for socialization. What appears to be warranted is a change of emphasis on external methods of control to techniques that foster the development of self-control. In the next sections

we will review the management strategies typically used in many inner city schools and then contrast them with those that we consider more appropriate.

TRADITIONAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

When the high percentage of teaching time usually spent on behavior management in inner city classrooms is considered, the typical assumption made is that the problem lies with those "unmanageable kids" in these classrooms. If the child lacks certain essential social skills, then the chances are good that he will produce inappropriate behavior in school. Since teachers are socialization agents, however, we believe that the type of behavior produced in a classroom is also a function of the way these children are treated; that the problems that arise in these situations may be attributed to the interface of the child and agents of socialization. We also believe that existing or traditional methods of managing behavior in inner city classrooms have not been ideally effective in bringing about desired behavioral change in children primarily because of deficits in the processes used to manage behavior. Part of the problem may be the result of traditional management approaches which have focused on behavioral control rather than behavioral change.

In order to discuss traditional classroom management practices we have grouped them under three headings: nonmanagement, overmanagement, and mismanagement.

We have found that teachers who do not use available management techniques are those who typically view their role as providing academic instruction solely. While the goal of giving children needed academic skills is admirable, many inner city children need highly motivating academic presenta-

tions. Their social behavior may interfere with instruction and they may be submotivated to acquire important academic skills. In these cases the goal of instruction in core curriculum may become secondary to that of getting their behavior under control and of motivating them.

Nonmanagement may be obvious when teachers fail to provide clear-cut behavioral expectancies for their students in the form of rules or verbal instructions. Another example of inadequate management practices is seen in the failure of teachers to provide immediate consequences, positive or aversive, for a particular behavior. Unless a teacher pays off a student's prosocial behavior with praise or positive events, it is improbable that he will behave appropriately on future occasions. Teachers also may not systematically apply aversive outcomes such as loss of privileges or time out when these are called for. Our observations suggest that when aversive techniques are used, they are most often used late in a behavioral chain--after the problem behavior is full blown. By neglecting to use available management strategies at appropriate times, teachers may fail to provide the child with information about behavior-consequent relationships that is essential to his developing self-controlling behaviors.

In contrast to problems of nonmanagement, some teachers may overmanage their students. In overmanaged classrooms, children may be exposed to such excessive structure that they may be behaviorally stifled, docile and overcompliant. An example of overmanagement may be found in a special education classroom wherein children have been kept on a token economy system long after its need has expired. We have found that children in such situations tend to show such infrequent incidents of

their problem behavior that they never are given a chance to acquire competing behaviors. Obviously children who are working most of the time cannot show problem behaviors; but problem behaviors cannot be dealt with if they are never manifest.

While nonmanagement and overmanagement practices may be problems in themselves, another is that of mismanagement. Mismanagement refers to the faulty use of many potentially valuable management strategies. Because of the potentially long-range ill effects of mismanagement practices on children, this may represent a more serious problem than nonmanagement or overmanagement. Mismanagement may be seen in the use of corporal punishment and criticism, sarcasm and nagging, in the giving of low grades, in the expulsion of children and in the misapplication of student and parent interviews.

In practice, mismanagement may be readily apparent in the sole or excessive reliance on aversive consequences as control methods. Typically, corporal punishment is used as the first, and often, the only form of intervention in many cases. The use of punishment may cause the child's behavior to be temporarily suppressed, thus providing an incentive for the teacher to use this technique. However, the long-range results may be erratic. First the child may come to associate the act of punishment with the instructional environment. Pain or anxiety and avoidance cues may be conditioned to not only the classroom but to the teacher as well (Aronfreed, 1968). Such cues may interfere with not only academic behavior but contribute to problems in interpersonal relationships with authority figures. Teachers who use corporal punishment also provide models of aggressive behavior so that the child learns that aggressive

behavior is acceptible if one is larger or more powerful than the victim.

Children may also develop negative attitudes toward the school environment when teachers use criticism or sarcasm, nagging, grades, and expulsion as aversive consequences. There are indications that many inner city children come to school with low or negative estimates of themselves and their potential. If this is true, then negative evaluations provided by teachers may add to an existing problem of low self-esteem.

Nagging is a common technique which usually gets immediate results. Like physical punishment, nagging usually causes the undesirable behavior to be temporarily suspended. It also causes the child's behavior to remain managerially dependent on external feedback. This technique may also serve to reinforce negative behavior through attention and serve to create a negative classroom climate wherein students lack initiative and are not motivated to alter their behavior.

The practice of giving low grades for inadequate antisocial behavior may serve as a failure experience in the school causing children loss of face and self esteem. When children are given low grades, they may become unmotivated as high marks seem remote and inaccessible. Also, when children must compete with others for grades instead of with their own records, grades may lose their value as potentially motivating incentives.

Another widely used aversive technique for managing inner city school children's behavior is that of expulsion or suspension. While this may be an effective method of control and in some cases the only solution, its effects may not always be desirable. For some children expulsion may be doing them a favor: it may allow them to escape from a miserable situation.

Also, expulsion is not constructive because removal of the child from school results in their being unable to learn a new, more appropriate, way of behaving.

While child and parent interviews are frequently used methods for controlling classroom behaviors, they may often be misused. For example, if a child can only get teacher attention when he misbehaves and then is talked with about his behavior, chances are that he may tend to misbehave to get this form of adult attention. Parents of inner city children probably are frequently called in for a conference after the child misbehaves. It would be the exceptional inner city classroom teacher who would call a parent conference to discuss how well the child was doing in school; yet, the latter approach is the more acceptable use of the parent conference because the child receives attention for appropriate behavior.

Through nonmanagement, overmanagement, and mismanagement, then, teachers typically fail to provide not only adequate external control for inner city school children, but, more importantly, they do not meet their needs for socialization. By excessive reliance on often misapplied methods of external control, teachers do not allow children to develop skills that will enable them to become self-directing individuals. The next section will review methods that may be adopted to foster self-control skills in children.

STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPING SELF-CONTROL

There are several advantages of training children in behavioral self-management. First, the child receives independence training and learns skills that may transfer outside of the classroom. Second, such an approach

removes the teacher from the typical authoritarian role s/he must assume; the teacher and the child may become allies in working on his problem behaviors rather than antagonists. Also, by giving children responsibility for self-management, the teacher is freed to offer more instruction. Finally, because such training emphasizes counting and recording, children are able to learn valuable skills while compiling a record of their classroom progress (Lovitt, 1973).

Establishing a classroom environment that fosters children's self-control requires a reconceptualization of the usual role of the teacher in managing behavior. Instead of acting as an agent of control, the teacher must think of her/himself as one who facilitates self-control. We are not implying that the teachers do nothing or that children should be given total responsibility for their behavior. On the contrary, teachers may have to impose firm external controls on children until they are capable of acceptable self-regulation. The teacher takes an active role in teaching children self-control by both direct and indirect methods. S/he may develop these skills through general strategies emphasizing development of antecedent controls or through more direct methods such as self-monitoring, goal-setting/self evaluation, and self-reinforcement.

GENERAL STRATEGIES

First, the teacher as a model of self-control should not be overlooked. Research has demonstrated that children, especially younger ones, are quite susceptible to the effects of modeling. In fact, children appear to learn many of their self-evaluative and self-reinforcement behaviors by observing adult behavior (Bandura & Kupers, 1964; Bandura, Grusec & Menlove, 1967; McMains & Liebert, 1968). If a teacher uses threats of violence and corporal punishment as control methods, s/he can expect that her/his students will

acquire this behavior and regard it as acceptable. On the other hand, teachers who present acceptable models of self-control themselves have a right to and can expect their students to model their behavior. Children acquire many, if not most, of their social behaviors through observation. Teachers should keep this knowledge constantly in mind when managing their behavior.

Madsen, Becker, and Thomas (1968) have advocated the use of classroom rules in managing problem behaviors. The importance of this research in training children in self-regulation is that the use of rules facilitates the development of internal mediators which may serve a guidance function for children. Rules not only provide information about environmental expectancies operative in a situation, but can be used for directing behavior when external controls are weak or unclear.

To be used to the best advantage, rules should be clearly stated and enforceable. Whenever possible, students should be allowed to participate in the rule-setting procedures; if a child feels that he is a part of the power system it is more likely that he will cooperate when enforcement time rolls around. Rules also should be reviewed continually to make certain that they are remembered. One good way for reminding an individual child about a rule is to have him state the rule and the reasons for it when he has broken one; if he has questions about it, this will usually become apparent at this time. Teachers who make rules should fully expect to have to enforce them. They also should make adherence to them pay off through appropriate reinforcement for compliance.

Another general strategy that teachers may use to develop children's self-control is to encourage children in assuming responsibility for their behavior. This may be accomplished by arranging the situation so that he can easily see how his behavior leads to a particular social outcome by

creating a structured environment (Haring & Phillips, 1962). The teacher, through consistent use of positive and immediate feedback--social praise, approval or the administration of concrete reinforcers--and aversive events--time out, loss of privileges, or limit setting--can convey to the student what consequences his behavior will bring.

Teachers may also teach children to predict the outcomes of his behavior through the use of interviews. Such interviews perhaps are most effective when the child is calm and accepting and not in the midst of a display of emotional fireworks. In the interview, the teacher may first ask the child to identify the particular problem behavior and describe why it was a problem. Next, s/he may focus on having the child list or describe the events that led up to his displaying the behavior. Finally, the teacher should have the child list or describe the consequences that his behavior produced. By using these procedures, the teacher may aid the child in gaining mediational control over his behavior that may help him avoid unwanted future conflicts.

Finally, a powerful technique generally available for teachers to use in developing children's self-regulatory skills is behavioral rehearsal. Behavioral rehearsal is a natural adjunct to the behavior-consequence relations training suggested above. Through an interview a teacher can have the child verbalize a problem and then have him list alternative behavioral outcomes or means of avoiding the conflict situation. Next, the preferred solution is selected and rehearsed so that this ideal becomes a part of the student's behavioral repertoire. An entire gamut of prosocial behaviors can be taught through the use of rehearsal--from the resolution of conflicts with authority

figures to the acquisition of appropriate behaviors in a job interview. Behavioral rehearsal is especially adapted for groups. Its use in these situations takes advantage of peer modeling effects in which different group members are able to witness not only the behavior itself but also its social consequences.

Blackhurst (1974), for example, used this approach with good results in a contrived classroom situation. He invited a policeman to visit his class to talk about what might happen should the students be confronted with a traffic violation. He selected an aggressively-prone boy as the subject. First, a scene was enacted in which the policeman pretended to pull the student over in his car for speeding and begin writing him a citation. When the boy began verbally abusing him, the policeman got belligerent in return and pretended to arrest the boy for disorderly conduct. Then the scene was replayed. This time the boy was given instructions to react calmly and to display socially acceptable behaviors. Some time after this training, the student was actually accosted by a policeman for running a stop sign; he reportedly remembered his training and was able to avoid possible arrest by demonstrating the positive behavior he had learned in the classroom training situation.

The management strategies discussed above all are intended to aid children in developing antecedent controls over their behavior. Children who are exposed to appropriate adult models, who are taught rules and contingent relationships between their behavior and rewarding events, who are made aware of the potential outcomes of a course of action, and who have practiced prosocial behaviors should have more mediational or internal responses for dealing with environmental requirements. These mediators serve to interpose a delay between situational stimuli and the response to them. By providing children with these responses, where they are deficient, they may be taught

greater self-control.

Direct Strategies

In addition to using general strategies for supporting self-control described previously, there are a number of methods that teachers may use to teach children self-regulatory behavior directly. This may be done by actively involving the child in monitoring his own behavior, in setting acceptable performance standards, in objectively evaluating his performance, and in appropriately reinforcing himself.

Self-Monitoring. This procedure involves the observation of a specific target behavior and recording and charting its frequency. In engaging in these activities, the child may be made aware of his behavior, its incidence, and the conditions under which it occurs. Self-monitoring may not only help make the child aware of behavior-consequent relationships, it may also interrupt an ongoing chain of behaviors (Thoresen & Mahoney, 1974). If, for example, a child had difficulty controlling argumentative behaviors, a teacher might have him count and record the number of times he thought about arguing with others. This might serve to head off a sequence of undesirable events such as: perception of threat by another - thoughts of aggressive action - approach - arguing - hitting/open aggression. By tallying and charting his urges-to-argue frequency, a child not only may become alerted to the fact that he is aroused. Such an awareness also may be an essential discrimination for performing another, competing behavior.

There are several ways that a teacher may initiate a self-monitoring program for a child. S/he can begin by listing a number of target behaviors that a child may need to work on. S/he also can ask the child to identify several behaviors that he may need to change. An interview with the student

could reveal those behaviors that have been identified by both, and a target behavior selected fror among these. If the child has difficulty identifying problem behaviors, the teacher may present him with three or four well-defined target behaviors and allow him to select one that he feels he can work on most easily. Allowing the child some power over the selection of his target behaviors may encourage motivation to cooperate.

Most workers select only one target behavior at a time to change. This helps keep the child from feeling overwhelmed. Often, an improvement of one behavior may lead to improvement in another--depending on how much they compete or overlap. For example, increasing on-task behavior might result in a decrease in aggressive behavior simply because it is difficult to hit someone while completing a math assignment. The behavior selected for self-monitoring can be either increased, as in the case of a prosocial behavior, or decreased if it is a problem. Whatever behavior is selected for alteration, it is a good idea to make sure that the child knows what he is to count and record. This may be tested by having the student define the behavior in his own words.

After the behavior is identified and defined, self-monitoring may be initiated by using some method for recording the behavior. If the behavior is to be counted in seat, students can be given a card with the behavior defined on it in some place. The child simply has to tally his behavior as it occurs. (e.g. Broden, Hall & Mitts, 1971). It the child is required to move about, he might be given a golf-score wrist counter for recording. (Lindsley, 1968). Kunzelmann (1970) has even used what he calls "countoons" to have young children record their behaviors. A countoon consists of pictures of the behavior of the child with an accompanying set of numbers which the child circles when he finds himself engaging in the pictured behavior.

For some reason a child may not be able to accurately record his behavior when it occurs--he may be unaware that he is engaging in the behavior. There are several ways of overcoming this problem. One method is to set a kitchen timer at varying intervals--from one to five minutes, for example--and have the child record his behavior when the bell sounds. Glynn, Thomas and Shee (1973) found that a convenient and effective way of aiding a child's discrimination was to play a tape recording of randomly occurring tones. Children were required to record their behavior whenever the tone sounded. Still other possibilities exist for making a child aware of his behavior. The teacher her/himself may serve as a periodic reminder. Also, cross-peer monitoring of target behavior is, as yet, an untried possibility.

Self-monitoring has been used mainly in conjunction with other techniques. Some studies have shown the procedure to be effective both in increasing study behaviors (Broden, Hall & Mitts, 1971) and in reducing disruptive behaviors (Bolstad & Johnson, 1972; Lovitt, 1973). One caution in the use of this procedure, however, is that the child should be periodically checked on his recording accuracy at recording his observations by having another person monitor him. While some studies indicate that this is a promising technique, others seem to indicate that it has limited effectiveness when used by itself. (Thoresen & Mahoney, 1974). Classroom teachers who wish to employ self-monitoring would be advised to combine it with daily feedback and reinforcement or with self-evaluation and/or self-reinforcement programs. Given the present information, then, self-monitoring may be regarded as an important first step in a self-control program.

Goal Setting and Self-Evaluation. Certainly goal-setting and self-evaluation play a major role in behavioral self-regulation. Children who are adept

at setting realistic performance standards and who are objective in their evaluations appear less likely to face overwhelming frustration or to develop motivation problems than children who are not versed in these skills. Once performance standards have been set, the self-evaluative process serves a feedback function in allowing an individual to reevaluate his performance standards. Self-evaluation also may serve as a discriminative stimulus for administering self-reinforcement (Kanfer & Karoly, 1972). Accurate goal-setting and self-evaluative behavior is a learned skill which may have to be taught to children who have become reliant on external methods of control.

Once students can accurately self-monitor and record their behaviors, the teacher may want to train them to select their own target behaviors, establish weekly performance standards and evaluate their own progress toward meeting these. Ideally, children should have a daily academic goal in each subject and one behavioral goal for the week. Data from self-monitoring activities can be used by the teacher and student for establishing realistic performance standards. For example, if a child, in counting the number of times he "butts in" on others' conversations, averages 10 times per day, the teacher might want to assign him a weekly goal to reduce this problem to an average five times per day. Daily recording of the behavior and progress charting can supply the child with ongoing feedback concerning his performance.

At first, a teacher may have to establish both the target behaviors and/or specify the performance goals for each student. As the child becomes acccus-tomed to these procedures, the teacher may begin to transfer this responsibility to the child through a series of steps. The teacher and student, through conference, may agree on an appropriate goal. If the student has difficulty establishing a goal in this stage, the teacher may help by giving him a choice of several goals and allowing him to choose among these alternatives. Children

who feel comfortable in selecting their goals may then be allowed to choose their own target behaviors and/or establish their own weekly goals.

Teachers may also use the group process of selecting goals and evaluating progress. At the end of each week each child may bring his record to the group to share. Each may, in turn, publicly review his progress and declare whether he should adjust his goal upwards or downwards. If, however, he feels that he has made satisfactory progress toward mastering his problem he may suggest that he be allowed to select a new target behavior. Other children in the group at this point can comment on any proposed changes in the child's goals; very often, they may suggest other behaviors that the child needs to work on. We have found that these procedures are both highly motivating for individual members, but they also create an atmosphere in which group members aid each other in meeting personal goals.

Lovitt (1973) has used a step-wise program similar to the one proposed above for training a 12-year-old boy to take over the responsibility for managing his own academic schedule. Following a baseline period in which his academic response rate was calculated across subjects, the student was allowed to schedule his assignments in any order he chose; going to lunch and release from school were used contingently to insure that he completed his assignments. In the next phase, he was allowed to correct his own assignments. After he was accustomed to correcting his work, the teacher went over his academic progress chart with him each day and evaluated his progress. In the final phases of the program, he was allowed to chart his own progress and, finally, to set his own academic goals in three of his six academic assignment areas. As the program progressed from externally-directed format to a self-administered one, the student's academic response rate increased significantly.

Although some studies have shown that whether the goal is externally set or self-set makes little difference in either the child's performance on academic tasks (Felixbrod & O'Leary, 1973) or his pattern of self-evaluations and self-reinforcement (Polsgrove, 1974), Lovitt (1973) and Lovitt and Curtiss (1969) have found that elementary-age children become more task-involved if they are allowed to specify their own contingency arrangements. A caution in the use of these methods, however, is that, like self-monitoring, they may require periodic checking by the teacher and external reinforcement for accuracy. Given our present state of knowledge, accurate goal-setting self-evaluation may be most easily established when they follow appropriate training such as in a token economy system (Kaufman & O'Leary, 1972) or when they are used with other self-control techniques such as self-monitoring and self-reinforcement.

Self-Reinforcement. Self-reinforcement is the final step in the self-control process. It is believed to operate similarly to external reinforcement in changing the probability of the behavior it follows. A person may reinforce himself with positive thoughts, pleasurable images or feelings, by engaging in preferred activities or by allowing himself access to tangible objects for performing a particular act. Self-reinforcement may be positive or negative. For example, a student may allow himself to go to lunch only after he has completed a period of study; after striking out in a baseball game, a player may verbally berate himself for swinging at an outside pitch. Although self-reinforcement is used to explain how behavior is maintained or altered independently of external control, most writers agree that the ultimate source of control is external (e.g., Skinner, 1953). This suggests that any self-control program must be continaully sustained by external support.

After a student has fairly mastered establishing his behavioral and/or academic goals and is adept at monitoring and evaluating his performance, the teacher may want to phase him into administering his own consequences. This procedure presumes some sort of natural, token, or point reinforcer in use in the classroom. If a child is working under a token economy or point system, for example, it is a simple matter to relinquish the administration of tokens or points to the students. An easy way to do this is to select the period of the day or the subject area in which the child shows least difficulty and use this as the starting point. The child is then given control over his points or tokens with the understanding that if he misappropriates them he may have this opportunity suspended temporarily until he is able to administer them to himself appropriately. Often, this is a crucial point in a child's self-control program. As he becomes skilled at administering his own reinforcing events, during one period of the day, he may gradually be given control of other periods.

A number of studies have investigated the use of self-reinforcement as a means of training children to manage their personal behavior. (Glynn, 1970; Drabman, Spitalnik & O'Leary, 1973; Bolstad & Johnson, 1972; and Frederiksen & Frederiksen, 1975). All have reached essentially the same conclusion: that self-reinforcement is as effective as external reinforcement in maintaining and controlling behavior. Although the results are meager, the present data appear to indicate that the teacher's best application of a self-reinforcement program is after the children have received adequate training.

From the available research and information on the topic, the following procedures are suggested as a procedure for developing children's self-control. However, they by no means should be considered as the only way a self-control program could be implemented.

Phase I: Self-monitoring and guided self-evaluation

In this phase the child's target behavior may be assigned by his teacher or suggested to him by his classmates in a group situation. The student is responsible for recording his behavior, graphing it and evaluating the results with the aid of his teacher or peers.

Phase II: Partial goal selection + self-monitoring + self-evaluation

In Phase II the child may be given responsibility for monitoring and evaluating his behavior but allowed a choice of target behaviors or goals on which to work.

Phase III: Goal selection + self-monitoring + self-evaluation

In this phase the child may be responsible for selecting his own behavioral goals subject to the approval of the teacher and other class members. As in the phase above, he may both monitor his behavior and evaluate his progress.

Phase IV: Goal selection + self-monitoring + self-evaluation + partial self-reinforcement

In Phase IV the child may be responsible for establishing his own goals, and observing, recording and evaluating his own behavior. He may also be responsible for administering himself points, free-time, or tokens for part of the day.

Phase V: Goal-selection + self-monitoring + self-evaluation + self-reinforcement

This is the final phase and one in which the child may specify his own goals, record, chart, and evaluate his progress, and administer himself reinforcing consequences.

SUMMARY

This paper has been concerned with the identification of what we feel is a central problem facing inner-city schools: that of providing appropriate socialization for children in these institutions. Our view is that these children suffer not so much as a result of certain cultural discrepancies but that many of them come to school lacking in the social behaviors necessary to insure their survival in school and, by extension, the mainstream of society. Often their teachers view their problem behavior as inherent in the child or family. They think that the child knows how to behave appropriately but does not comply with prevailing school expectancies out of defiance or antisocial attitudes.

But objective analysis reveals that many of the problems that arise with these children reflect the way in which they are managed in typical inner-city classrooms. That is, the school environment, by not providing clear-cut behavioral expectancies, through the overuse of controls, and by the excessive reliance on aversive disciplinary techniques, actually contributes to a large share of the problem itself. Rather than seeing themselves as controlling agents in maintaining the existing school power base, our proposal is that inner-city school administrators and teachers reevaluate their roles--to view themselves as agents for facilitating their children's development of school appropriate behaviors.

We advocate that inner-city school personnel adopt a range of promising strategies that have recently grown out of the child management literature that can be used to promote children's self-control. It is our belief that this goal is best accomplished by providing these children with consistent rule-structure, by training them in developing an awareness for their behavior and its consequences, by coaching them in prosocial behavioral alternatives and by directly teaching them self-regulatory behaviors. While these proposals

are by no means seen as panaceas for correcting the myriad of problems in the inner-city schools, they do provide some concrete suggestions as to where we might begin

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Aronfreed, J. Conduct and conscience: Socialization of internalized control over behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Bandura, A., Grusec, J., & Menlove, F.L. Some social determinants of self-monitoring reinforcement systems. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5(4), 449-455.

Bandura, A. & Kupers, C.J. Transmission of patterns of self-reinforcement through modeling. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 1-9.

Baughman, E.E. Black Americans. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Blackhurst, A.E. Personal Communication, June 20, 1974.

Bolstad, O.D. and Johnson, S.M. Self-regulation in the modification of disruptive classroom behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1972, 5, 443-454.

Bridgette, R.E. Self-esteem in Negro and White Southern Adolescents. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1970.

Broden, M., Hall, R.V., & Mitts, B. The effect of self-recording on the classroom behavior of two eighth-grade students. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1971, 4, 191-199.

Coleman, J.S. et al. Equality of Educational Opportunities. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Drabman, R.S., Spitalnik, R. & O'Leary, K.D. Teaching self-control to disruptive children. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis. 1973, 6, 10-16.

Fasold, R.W. & Wolfram, W. Some linguistic features of Negro dialect. In R.W. Fasold and R.W. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching Standard English in the Inner City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

Felixbrod, J.L. & O'Leary, K.D. Effects of reinforcement on children's academic behavior as a function of self-determined and externally-imposed contingencies. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1973, 241-250.

Frederiksen, L.W. & Frederiksen, C.B. Teacher-determined and self-determined token reinforcement in a special education classroom. Behavior Therapy, 1975, 6(3), 310-314.

Friedman, N.L. Cultural deprivation: A commentary in the sociology of knowledge. In J.L. Frost and G.R. Hawkes (Eds.), The Disadvantaged Child. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1970.

Garrison, M. & Hammill, D. Who are the retarded? Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 13-20.

Glynn, E.L. Classroom applications of self-determined reinforcement. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis. 1970, 3, 123-132.

Glynn, E.L., Thomas, J.D., & Shee, S.M. Behavioral self-control of on-task behavior in an elementary classroom. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1973, 6, 105-113.

Grambs, J.D. The self-concept: Basis for reeducation of Negro youth. In W.C. Kvaraceus, J.S. Gibson, F. Patterson, B. Seasholes & J.D. Grambs (Eds.), Negro Self-concept: Implications for School and Citizenship. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Grier, W.H. & Cobbs, P.M. Black Rage. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Groff, P.J. Dissatisfaction in teaching the CD child. Phi Delta Kappan, 1963, 45, (3), 76.

Hall, E. Special miseducation: The politics of special education. Inequality in Education, 1970, 4, (3), 17-29.

Haring, N.G. & Phillips, E.L. Educating Emotionally Disturbed Children. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Jencks, C., Smith, M., et al. Inequality. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Jensen, A. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 39, 1-123.

Johnson, J.J. Special education for the inner city: A challenge for the future or another means of cooling the mark out. The Journal of Special Education, 1969, 3, 241-251.

Kanfer, F.H. & Karoly, P. Self-control: A behavioristic excursion into the lion's den. Behavior Therapy, 1972, 3, 398-416.

Kaufman, K.F. & O'Leary, K.D. Reward, cost, and self-evaluation procedures for disruptive adolescents in a psychiatric hospital. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis. 1972, 5, 293-309.

Kunzelmann, H.D. (Ed.) Precision teaching. Seattle: Special Child Publications, 1970.

Labov, W. The logic of nonstandard English. In F. Williams (Ed.), Language and Poverty. Chicago: Markham, 1970.

Larson, S.C. The influence of teacher expectations on the school performance of handicapped children. Focus on Exceptional Children, 1975, 6, (8), 1-14.

Lindsley, O.R. A reliable wrist counter for recording behavior rates. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1, 77-78.

Lovitt, T.C. Self-management projects with children with behavioral disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities. 1973, 6 (3), 15-28.

Lovitt, T.C. and Curtiss, K.A. Academic response rate as a function of teacher and self-imposed contingencies. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1969, 2, 49-53.

McDonald, R.L. & Gynther, M.D. Relationship of self and ideal-self descriptions with sex, race, and class in southern adolescents. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 85-88.

McMains, M. & Liebert, R.M. Influence of discrepancies between successively modeled self-reinforcement criterion on the adoption of a self-imposed standard. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8(2), 166-171.

Madsen, C.H., Becker, W.C., & Thomas, D.R. Rules, praise, and ignoring: Elements of elementary classroom control. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1(2), 139-150.

Mercer, J.R. Sociocultural factors in labeling mental retardates. Peabody Journal of Education, 1971, 48, 188-203.

Miller, H.L. The Effect of Information on Student Beliefs about the Slum School. New York: Hunter College Project True, 1963.

Mosley, W.J. The disproportionate placement of black children in special classes and prejudice among white prospective teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1973.

Mosley, W.J. & Spicker, H.H. Mainstreaming and the educationally deprived. Theory into Practice, 1975, 14, (2), 73-81.

Polsgrove, L. The Effects of Goal Sources, and Success and Failure on Self-Regulatory Behavior in Behaviorally Disordered and Normal Children. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1976.

Rist, R.C. Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40, 411-451.

Rivlin, H.N. Teachers for the Schools in our Big Cities. New York: The City University of New York, 1962.

Roberts, J.I. Affective factors and environment. In J.I. Roberts (Ed.), School Children in the Urban Slum. New York: Free Press, 1967.

Skinner, B.F. Science and Human Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1953.

Wendland, M.M. Self-concept in southern Negro and white adolescents as related to rural-urban residence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1967.

Williams, F. Language, attitude, and social change. In F. Williams (Ed.), Language and Poverty. Chicago: Markham, 1970.